



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,272	09/25/2001	Michael P. Lyle	RECOP018	9955
21912 7590 01/10/2008 VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP 10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200 CUPERTINO, CA 95014			EXAMINER PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

720

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/964,272	LYLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Pyzocha	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 15-17, 19-21 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 15-17, 19-21 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23-26 are pending.
2. Amendment filed 11/23/2007 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 10, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over I'Anson et al (EPO 0474932), in view of Park (US 6363458), in view of Shanklin et al (US 6487666) and further in view of Karpf (US 6334192).

As per claims 1, and 19-21, I'Anson discloses identifying at least two valid states associated with the network protocol in which a first host system communicating with a second host system using the network protocol may be placed; defining at least one valid transition between a first state of the at least

Art Unit: 2137

two valid states and a second state of the at least two valid states; determining that a connection under the network protocol is in the first state; analyzing the stream based at least in part on the determination that the connection under the network protocol is in a first state to determine whether the packet is associated with the at least one valid transition (see p. 3 lines 22-39 and p. 4 lines 27-49).

I'Anson fails to disclose defining an invalid state with a plurality of transitions to the invalid state and expressing the at least one valid transition and the invalid transition in the form of a regular expression and using the regular expression to analyze the network protocol stream.

However, Park teaches the use of an invalid state with a plurality of transitions to the invalid state (see column 7 line 15 through column 8 line 41 and Figure 2a) and Shanklin et al teaches the use of regular expressions (see column 6 lines 39-57).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the invalid state with a plurality of transitions to the invalid state of Park and Shanklin et al's regular expressions defining all transitions to analyze the protocol of I'Anson.

Art Unit: 2137

Motivation to do so would have been to invalidate requests and to recognize and evaluate identifiers, special symbols, or other tokens.

The modified I'Anson, Park, and Shanklin et al system fails to explicitly disclose the transitions to the invalid state being direct and taking an action associated with that invalid transition.

However, Karpf teaches direct transitions from a first state to an invalid state where an action associated with the transition is taken (see Figure 14 and column 17 lines 24-35).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the transitions of the modified I'Anson, Park, and Shanklin et al system to be direct and to take an action.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow the system to provide error messages.

As per claim 2, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system discloses compiling the regular expression into computer code (see Shanklin et al column 6 lines 39-57).

As per claims 10-11, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system discloses keeping track of which of the at least two states the first host system currently is in and changing the tracked state of the first host system from the

Art Unit: 2137

first of the at least two states to the second of the at least two states in the event the analysis of the network protocol stream indicates the at least one valid transition has taken place (see I'Anson p. 4 lines 27-49).

As per claim 13, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system discloses the invalid transition indicates that a security-related event has taken or is taking place and defining a further state corresponding to the invalid operation (see p. 4 lines 18-26 where the security related event is the intrusion of Shanklin et al as applied with Park).

As per claims 15-17, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system discloses keeping track of which state, from the set comprising the at least two states and the further state, the first host system currently is in; and changing the state of the first host system to the further state in the event that the analysis of the network protocol stream indicates the invalid operation has taken place and in the event that the analysis of the network protocol stream indicates the invalid operation has taken place, an indication that the invalid operation has taken place then discontinuing analysis of the network protocol stream once the state of the first host system has been changed to the further state (see I'Anson page 4).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claims 25 and 26, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system discloses the invalid transitions correspond to a plurality of disallowed security events and performing error handling (see Shanklin column 2 lines 16-21 and Park column 8 lines 12-20).

5. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Wijendran (AWK-to-C Translator).

As per claims 3-4, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system fails to disclose the use of optimal C programming language code.

However, Wijendran teaches this optical C code (see page 1).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Wijendran's optical C code in the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system.

Motivation to do so would have been to maximize runtime performance (see page 1).

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al,

Art Unit: 2137

and Karpf system as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Mangione-Smith (How many vector registers are useful?).

As per claim 5, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system fails to disclose the use of nearly optimal computer code.

However, Mangione-Smith teaches nearly optical code (see page 1).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Mangione-Smith's nearly optical code in the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system.

Motivation to do so would have been that nearly optimal code requires less vector registers (see page 1).

7. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Blam (US 6467041).

As per claim 6, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system fails to disclose copying the stream to a third party to be analyzed.

However, Blam teaches a third party analyzer (see column 6 lines 5-29).

Art Unit: 2137.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Blam's third party analyzer to analyze the protocol analyzer of the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system.

Motivation to do so would have been to perform the analysis regardless of what resources are on the network or client (see column 6 lines 5-29).

As per claims 7-9, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, Karpf and Blam system discloses the network protocol stream comprises packets of data, each packet being associated with a sequence number indicating its position relative to other packets in the protocol stream, and the third system reassembles the packets into the order indicated by the respective sequence numbers of the packets received where a copy of the network protocol stream is maintained in the third system until analysis has been completed and in the event the packets are received by the third system in sequence number order, a copy is maintained in the third system only of those packets comprising the portion of the network protocol currently under analysis (see I'Anson pages 4-5 and Blam column 6 lines 5-29).

8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al,

Art Unit: 2137

and Karpf system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Brown et al (US 6604075).

As per claim 23, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system fails to disclose performing error handling that is specific for one of the plurality of invalid transitions.

However, Brown et al teaches the error handling of a specific invalid state (see column 11 lines 9-18).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include error handling of a specific invalid state in the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system.

Motivation to do so would have been that the error needs to be handled by an application or user with specific knowledge associated with the processing.

9. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Oran (US 6275574).

As per claim 24, the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system fails to disclose grouping the regular expressions according to their similarity.

Art Unit: 2137

However, Oran teaches such grouping (see column 8 lines 8-21).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to group the regular expressions of the modified I'Anson, Park, Shanklin et al, and Karpf system.

Motivation to do so would have been to define precedence for the regular expressions.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments, see page 8 of the response, filed 11/23/2007, with respect to the rejection under the first paragraph of 35 USC 112 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, and 24-26 has been withdrawn.

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 19-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

Art Unit: 2137

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Parish et al. and Meek et al. teach methods of direct transitions to an invalid state.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

Art Unit: 2137

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-38655. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER